DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 946 TM 003 510

AUTHOR Fifer, Fred L., Jr.; Rush, Donald E.
TITLE Development of an Inservice Model Based on Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 7p.; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting (Chicago, Illinois, April 15-19, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50
DESCRIPTORS Faculty; *Individual Needs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Models; *Program Evaluation; School Surveys; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Kunkel McElhinney Model for Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Theoretically, inservice provides enrichment through a variety of activities. Unfortunately, many are not designed for individual needs and teachers are unable to relate to purposes of inservice. This model bases inservice on the implications and recommendations resulting from program evaluation using the Kunkel-McElhinney model. Following adaptation/administration of this evaluation, a report is compiled and presentation/confrontation with the faculty constitutes the initial inservice. Based on student feedback, through the evaluation, teachers become aware of pupil-perception which aids in the formulation of groundwork for examining appropriate curricular alternatives. Results--short/long range--support this as an effective inservice model. (Author)

DEVELOPMENT OF AN IN-SERVICE MODEL BASED ON PROGRAM EVALUATION

A PAPER

SUBMITTED TO THE ANNUAL AERA CONVENTION

by

FRED L. FIFER, JR.
REGION 10, EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
RICHARDSON, TEXAS

AND

DONALD E. RUSH
GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

APRIL 1974

DEVELOPMENT OF AN IN-SERVICE MODEL BASED ON PROGRAM EVALUATION

Introduction

Theoretically, in-service education is an effort on the part of public and private school systems to provide useful enrichment experiences for teachers through extension courses, curriculum committees, educational lectures, college courses and workshops, visits to other schools, visits to other classes and travel.[1] Unfortunately, many in-service programs are not designed for the individual needs of the teachers who attend the meetings. The failure to relate in-service plans and activities to the genuine needs of staff participants, failure to select appropriate activities for implementing program plans, and the failure to implement in-service program activities with sufficient staff and other resources to assure effectiveness are just a few of the mistakes which lead, subsequently, to teachers being unable to relate to the motives and thus assume, " . . . a role characterized by conformity and a minimal amount of initiative."[2]

In-service education is a process for change which must focus on, not only the individual needs of the teacher, but on

---

[1]Chester W. Harris, ed., Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York: The MacMillan Co., (1960) 11.

[2]Ronald Lippitt and Robert Fox, "Development and Maintenance of Effective Classroom Learning," Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change, Louis J. Rubin, ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, (1971) 153.

small group needs - (building faculty), and on the needs of larger groups - (districts or entire systems). Individual needs should be focused around the thoughts, ideas, and goals and the philosophy adopted by the system in which these participants function. Similarly, the broader philosophy should reflect a genuine interest in serving the needs of the individual. If change is to occur through involved, interested participation of all concerned parties, then some system for meaningful communication must be constructed. If the active participation of teachers in in-service education is of importance and if in-service education workshops are desirable catalysts for instigating and maintaining curricular innovation, then a practical and relatively inexpensive model for designing meaningful in-service programs must be developed and implemented.

There are two fundamental questions that need to be answered prior to the decision of using this model for in-service education. A receptivity and commitment to becoming aware of needs/changes in terms of building usage, facilities, equipment, line of authority, job re-definitions, replacement/retraining of personnel, needs of teachers/pupils and to the perceptions of teacher/pupil/administrator. Also, a willingness to effect appropriate change must be in evidence at each level of the institutional hierarchy in order for this model to be totally effective.

Secondly, the model is based upon the implications and recommendations drawn from a program evaluation report which has been conducted and prepared by a trained evaluation team for each individual school building. Even though the implications and recommendations for each building are stated in general terms, tabulations

of interviews, questionnaires and observations are available in the report and can be interpreted by each individual teacher. To date, all evaluation reports have resulted from applying instrumentation derived from the Kunkel-McElhinney Model for Program Evaluation.

Overview of the Kunkel-McElhinney Model for Program Evaluation

The Kunkel-McElhinney Model for Program Evaluation is based on two major assumptions. One assumption is that education is what pupils perceive as happening to them because they attend school. This includes all experiences in classrooms, hallways, activity programs, libraries, guidance and administrative offices, and playgrounds. The other assumption is that education is what teachers and other school personnel do that influences pupils. This includes the planning that is done, the materials and activities that are used, and the pupil behaviors that are rewarded and punished.

According to McElhinney and Kunkel, the major task of a program evaluation consists of obtaining an accurate description of these two components in the programs being evaluated. To obtain this description, three data collection methods from behavioral science research are used. Structured interviews are conducted with a sampling of students and with the entire population of teachers and other professional personnel. In addition, questionnaires are administered to all teachers and to all students in grades 4-12. In the primary grades (K-3), classroom observations followed by a small group interview (usually two students from each room) are used in lieu of individual student questionnaires.

Initially, the in-service model requires the adaptation of the Kunkel-McElhinney program evaluation instruments to fit the unique characteristics of each school building. Generally, this can be accomplished during a relatively short meeting between the evaluation team leader and the building principal or another person who is familiar with the building and its operational patterns. In the Northwest Indiana Curriculum Evaluation Project,[3] evaluation consultants trained local district personnel to collect data from adjoining school districts. In this fashion, the initial expense of collecting data was considerably reduced. In such a case, it was deemed advisable that outside evaluators be employed to organize the data and draft the final evaluation report.

The second phase of the model combines the critical appraisal of the final evaluation report by the staff of a given building with the findings and recommendations offered by the evaluation team. From these sources, the resident staff drafts a comprehensive statement of priorities.

The next step consists of incorporating all available resources into a hierarchy of alternative procedures for achieving each of the priorities. These are then systematically implemented until each priority is realized or until a more desirable state is attained.

The final phase of the model calls for a re-evaluation of

---

[3]Donald E. Rush, James H. McElhinney and Richard C. Kunkel, "Cooperative Curriculum Evaluation: Application of a Theoretical Curriculum Evaluation Model," paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Convention, April 1972, Chicago, Illinois.

the program, thus perpetuating and maintaining an on-going in-service process.

Such a process is presently being conducted in the Graysville (Georgia) Elementary School. Completion of the first round of the process should be in Summer 1974. Conclusive data concerning the effectiveness of the model should be available by Fall 1974.

Additional Benefits Resulting From the In-Service Process

Based on student feedback through the evaluation instruments, teachers can become aware of pupil-perception and thus establish viable, pertinent priorities upon which to formulate the groundwork for specific in-service activities. Once the initial priorities have been organized, task groups can be constituted and the authority delegated for the necessary tasks. Additional priorities or subgroups of priorities can be developed as needed and additional steps toward selecting appropriate curricular alternatives can begin. Although this method requires administrative and/or internal (teaching staff) leadership, the approach does place the principal (or designated leader) in the role of a facilitator. With this somewhat different perspective, the task groups attach themselves to a particular priority while still retaining rapport and working relationships with the total group function through reporting periods, etc. Once defined, these priorities can be classified into as many categories as needed, i.e., short-term, on-going, and/or long-term situations. Again, task forces align themselves in order to deal with the priorities as needed.

The incorporation of such activities as brainstorming, buzz

sessions, demonstrations, group discussions, role-playing, lectures, panel discussions, and films are used as these task groups deem necessary and as such become useful instruments for particular problems rather than just as scheduled, possibly totally unrelated, exercises for the occupation of some time-slot on a program. Interaction of people and ideas, and perceptions and impressions form the basis for the "total" involvement of personnel in this type of in-service.[4]

---

[4]C. Morrell Jones, "Highland Heights Junior High School: An Investigation of Curricular Change Derived From Program Evaluation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1973.